

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claim 14 is amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Saito (USPN 6,266,160). However, independent claim 1, as previously presented, clearly distinguishes over Saito.

Saito does not disclose a network facsimile machine having a capabilities storage unit and a communication control unit as required by independent claim 1 of the present invention. As shown in FIG. 2, Saito discloses two separate devices: an internet facsimile apparatus 1 and a server 3. Server 3 has a database of stored routing information. Internet facsimile apparatus 1 communicates with server 3 via an external network to acquire stored routing information. Internet facsimile apparatus 1 and server 3 are not one in the same device. Therefore, Saito does not disclose the limitations of the present invention as required by claim 1.

In contrast, the present invention discloses a network facsimile machine having a capabilities storage unit and a communication control unit. The capabilities storage unit stores data and reception capabilities for delivery recipients, such as a final recipient. The communications control unit receives delivery recipient-specifying data, looks up this data in the capabilities storage unit, and transmits reception capabilities of the specified delivery recipient.

In one aspect of the present invention, the network facsimile machine stores the reception capabilities of one or more final recipients and not only the reception capability of an intermediary relay apparatus. For example, the network facsimile

machine receives information of a final recipient (a receiver) from the remote facsimile apparatus (a sender) and declares the reception capability of the final recipient (the receiver) to the remote facsimile apparatus by referring the information received from the remote facsimile apparatus (the sender). The present invention can conduct facsimile transmission between the remote facsimile apparatus (the sender) and the network facsimile machine based, at least in part, on the reception capability of the final recipient (the receiver) and not on the reception capability of the network facsimile machine.

Since Saito does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, it cannot anticipate that claim or claims dependent thereon. Applicant submits that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 2-3 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Saito in view of Oseto (USPN 6,097,797). In view of the prior discussion of claim 1, Applicant submits that the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn due to their dependencies on claim 1 and in that Oseto does not remedy the deficiencies of Saito.

Claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Oseto in view of Saito. However, independent claim 14, as amended, clearly distinguishes over Oseto in view of Saito.

Claim 14 is amended to recite “locating internally stored reception capabilities relating to the received delivery recipient-specifying data” and “on the internally stored reception capabilities”. These limitations are not disclosed or suggested by Oseto, Saito, or any combination thereof.

The Office Action concedes that Oseto does not disclose “determining reception capabilities of a designated delivery recipient based on the received

recipient-specifying data". The Office Action purports that Saito discloses this limitation. However, Saito does not disclose the limitation of "locating internally stored reception capabilities relating to the received delivery recipient-specifying data and determining reception capabilities of a designated delivery recipient based on the received recipient-specifying data and on the internally stored reception capabilities" as recited in amended claim 14.

As discussed above with reference to independent claim 1, Saito does not disclose a network facsimile machine having internal storage for storing reception capabilities of designated delivery recipients. According to Saito in FIG. 2, this data must be accessed externally from server 3. The network facsimile apparatus 2 of Saito cannot internally locate reception capabilities of designated recipients. Thus, Saito does not disclose all the limitations of the present invention as required by amended independent claim 14.

Since Oseto and Saito do not disclose each and every element of claim 14, they cannot anticipate that claim or claims dependent thereon. Applicant submits that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/548,024
Amdt. Dated November 17, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81800.0121
Customer No. 26021

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in form for allowance. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: November 17, 2004

By: _____

Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701